arXiv:1401.6433v1 [stat.ME] 24 Jan 2014

FLEXIBLE BEHAVIORAL CAPTURE-RECAPTURE MODELLING

DANILO ALUNNI FEGATELLI AND LUCA TARDELLA

Abstract. We develop some new strategies for building and fitting new flexible classes of parametric capture-recapture models for closed populations which can be used to address a better understanding of behavioural patterns. We first rely on a conditional probability parameterization and review how to regard a large subset of standard capture-recapture models as a suitable partitioning in equivalence classes of the full set of conditional probability parameters. We then propose the use of new suitable quantifications of the conditioning binary partial capture histories as a device for enlarging the scope of flexible behavioural models and also exploring the range of all possible partitions. We show how one can easily find unconditional MLE of such models within a generalized linear model framework. We illustrate the potential of our approach with the analysis of some known datasets and a simulation study.

Dipartimento di Sanità Pubblica e Malattie Infettive, Sapienza Università di Roma, Piazzale A. Moro 5, 00185 Roma, Italy

E-mail address: danilo.alunnifegatelli@uniroma1.it

Dipartimento di Scienze statistiche, Sapienza Università di Roma, Piazzale A. Moro 5, 00185 Roma, Italy

E-mail address: luca.tardella@uniroma1.it

Key words and phrases. Behavioral response; Ecological model; Mark-recapture; Population size; Meaningful behavioural covariate; Markov models; Memory effect.
Version January 27, 2014.

1. Introduction

Multiple capture-recapture models are successfully employed to infer the unknown size and characteristics of a finite population whose complete enumeration is difficult or impossible due to the elusive nature of its units. These models are also routinely used in fields different from ecology such as software engineering, social sciences and epidemiology. Much progress has been made by researchers to enlarge the scope of available models and refine inferential techniques. There are now many available monographies and review articles which can offer a wide perspective of the current state of the art (White *et al.*, 1982; Seber, 1987; Schwarz and Seber, 1999; Borchers *et al.*, 2002; Amstrup *et al.*, 2005; Böhning, 2008; Morgan and McCrea, 2013; Royle *et al.*, 2013). In this paper we are interested in developing tools for a better understanding of the behavioural response to capture within a suitable and general model framework. Indeed empirical studies have provided evidence that mice, voles, small mammals and butterflies, among others, often exhibit a response to capture (Yang and Chao, 2005; Ramsey and Severns, 2010). However, relevant response to capture is also at stake in studies involving human population (Farcomeni and Scacciatelli, 2014). The most classical and basic way to account for behavioural response is to assume that once a unit/animal is captured its probability of being recaptured in all future trapping occasions is modified permanently. This enduring effect is called trap-happiness or trap-shyness effect according to whether the recapture probability becomes larger or smaller. This very simple one-parameter model flexibility sheds some light on the population under study and the presence of a behavioral effect can have a great impact on the estimate of the unknown population size (Yip *et al.*, 2000; Hwang *et al.*, 2002; Hwang and Huggins, 2011; Lee and Chen, 1998; Chao *et al.*, 2000; Lee *et al.*, 2003; Ghosh and Norris, 2005; Alunni Fegatelli and Tardella, 2013). However this specific type of behavioural effect is certainly only a limited device to approach the understanding of complex behavioral patterns that can be originated in multiple capture-recapture designs. In fact, an extended, more flexible perspective has been introduced in Yang and Chao (2005) where an ephemeral behavioural effect is modelled by using a Markov chain of the sequence of consecutive captures and Bartolucci and Pennoni (2007) developed a more complex model framework to account for dependence and heterogeneity with a hidden Markov model for the sequence of capture probabilities. More recently new ideas have been put forward by Ramsey and Severns (2010) and Farcomeni (2011) to enlarge the scope of possible behavioural patterns with new instances of enduring and ephemeral behavioural effects. In order to provide a general and flexible framework to deal with behavioural effects we start form the same idea in Farcomeni (2011) to fully parameterize the joint probabilities of the observable capture histories in terms of conditional probabilities and we show how the introduction of suitable behavioural covariates can help understanding and fitting meaningful behavioural models. We show how the appropriate handling of these covariates employed within a generalized linear model framework can help the researcher to improve model fitting of capture-recapture experiments with new interpretable behavioral patterns. Differently from the aforementioned articles we privilege the use of the unconditional likelihood for making inference. The paper is organized as follows: in Section 2 we introduce basic notation for our set up, the saturated parameterization for the probability of observing a sequence of consecutive binary outcomes corresponding to all capture occasions and the subset of all possible reduced models. In Section 3 we explain how one can define a time-dependent *behavioural covariate* to be exploited in a generalized linear model framework in order to achieve the two-fold goal of *i)* enlarging the scope of available behavioural effect models and *ii)* recover many (if not all) the existing ones by appropriate partitioning of the range of the behavioral covariate. In particular we show how a specific instance of numerical covariate can be obtained as a quantification of the binary subsequences of partial capture histories and can be thought of as a memory-effect covariate. In fact we will show the relation between this covariate and the class of Markovian models of

arbitrary order. In Section 4 we explain how one can infer on unknown parameters through the maximization of unconditional likelihood and how easily it can be implemented recycling standard generalized linear model routines. In Section 5 we show the usefulness of our covariate approach in discovering better parsimonious models with some real data examples. In Section 6 we verify the ability of model selection criterion to identify and distinguish among different behavioural patterns with a simulation study. Section 7 closes with some remarks and a discussion on future developments.

2. Saturated and reduced models based on partitions of conditional probabilities

Let us consider a discrete-time closed capture-recapture experiment in which the unknown population size N is assumed to be constant and individual trappings are recorded in t consecutive times. Moreover, we suppose that all units act independently, there is no misclassification i.e. all individuals are always recorded correctly and do not lose their marks. For notational convenience one can assume that units captured during the study are labelled from 1 to M and those not captured from $M+1$ to N. It is clear that we can observe only the firsts M rows of the matrix $\mathbf{X}$ with generic entri x_{ij} with $i = 1, ..., N$ and $j = 1, ..., t$. Denoting with $\mathcal{X} = \{0, 1\}$, the space of all possible capture histories for each unit is $\mathcal{X}^t = \{0, 1\}^t$ while the set of all observable capture histories is $\mathcal{X}^t_* = \mathcal{X}^t \setminus (0, \dots, 0)$ since the unobserved units are not sampled. As a starting point no individual heterogeneity is assumed for the probability of being captured at each time. We will discuss later on relaxation of this assumption.

In order to setup a natural flexible framework for characterizing the fundamental set of probabilities of all possible *complete* capture histories we follow Farcomeni (2011) and we rely upon the capture probabilities conditioned on each possible *partial* capture history as follows

$$\begin{cases} p_1() = Pr(X_{i1} = 1) \\ p_j(x_{i1}, ..., x_{ij-1}) = Pr(X_{ij} = 1 | x_{i1}, ..., x_{ij-1}) \qquad \forall j > 1 \, , \, \forall (x_{i1}, \dots, x_{ij-1}) \in \mathcal{X}^{j-1} \end{cases}$$

All these conditional probabilities can be arranged with a natural/conventional order in a $2^t - 1$ dimensional vector denoted with $\mathbf{p} = (p_1(), p_2(0), p_2(1), p_3(0,0), p_3(0,1), p_3(1,0), ..., p_t(0, ..., 0), ..., p_t(1, ..., 1))$ where, for example, the element $p_3(0,1)$ represents the probability of being captured at time 3 given that the unit is not captured in the first occasion while it is captured in the second occasion. For notational convenience and space saving we will often remove commas between binary digits when representing partial capture histories. The initial empty brackets () are understood as the absence of previous capture history at time 1. The vector $\mathbf{p}$ can be seen as a convenient reparameterization of the joint probabilities corresponding to all 2^t complete capture history configurations in $\mathcal{X}^t$. The conditional probabilities, rather than the joint probabilities, are more easily interpreted in the process of modelling the consequences determined by the change of behaviour due to a particular previous trapping history.
Notice that under the saturated reparameterization the probability of never being observed during the experiment is

$$P_0 = \left[(1 - p_1()) \prod_{j=2}^{t} (1 - p_j(0, \dots, 0)) \right] \tag{1}$$

This is one of the fundamental quantities for the estimation of the parameter of interest via likelihood maximization since $\hat{N} = \frac{M}{1-\hat{P}_0}$ where $\hat{P}_0$ is the MLE of P_0. This is of course true by definition of the conditional likelihood approach but it is still true with the unconditional likelihood provided that $\hat{P}_0$ is jointly determined with $\hat{N}$ according to the definition of the unconditional (or complete) likelihood.

From the saturated parametrization based on $\mathbf{p}$ one can specify a parsimonious nested model based on a suitable partition of the conditional probabilities in $\mathbf{p}$ in terms of equivalence classes. Let H be the set of all partial capture histories: $H = \{\ ()\ ,\ (0),\ (1),\ (00),\ (10),\ (01),\ (11),\ \dots\} = \cup_{j=0}^{t-1}\mathcal{X}^j$ where $\mathcal{X}^0 = \{()\}$. Let us denote with $\mathcal{H}_B$ one of the possible partitions of H in B disjoint subsets

$$\mathcal{H}_B = \{H_1, \dots, H_b, \dots, H_B\}$$

where each $H_b \subset H$. The role of the index set H is to list all the partial capture histories which may yield possible changes in the conditional capture probability depending on the past. Let us denote a generic partial capture history as follows $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_{l_\mathbf{x}})$ where $l_\mathbf{x}$ is the length of the binary vector. For each partition $\mathcal{H}_B$ we consider a corresponding reduced parameter vector of probabilities denoted with $\mathbf{p}_{\mathcal{H}_B} = (p_{H_1}, \dots, p_{H_B})$. The partition of capture histories in equivalence classes is such that

$$\forall \quad \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in H_b \quad \Rightarrow \quad p_{l_\mathbf{x}+1}(\mathbf{x}) = p_{l_{\mathbf{x}'}+1}(\mathbf{x}') = p_{H_b} \qquad \forall b = 1, \dots, B$$

Notice that when there is absence of previous capture history ($\mathbf{x} = ()$) we have $l_\mathbf{x} = 0$.
With the partition $\mathcal{H}_B$ of subsets of H representing equivalence classes we have just reviewed under a more convenient formalization the linear constrained approach in Farcomeni (2011) which indeed can be seen as stemmed from the works of Huggins (1989) and Alho (1990).

As a simple example of our formalization based on partitions of subsets of H as opposed to the linear constrained approach one can consider model M_b. Indeed it can be defined using two blocks of equality constraints

$$M_b : \begin{cases} p_1() = p_2(0) = p_3(0,0) = \dots = p_t(0, \dots, 0) = \pi_f \\ p_2(1) = p_3(1,0) = p_3(0,1) = \dots = p_t(1, \dots, 1) = \pi_r \end{cases}$$

It is easy to verify that if we interpret π_f as the probability of first capture and π_r as the probability of being recaptured one gets the most simple form of behavioural model with enduring effect usually denoted with M_b. Equivalently, in our partition notation, model M_b corresponds to a bipartition $\mathcal{H}_2(M_b) = \{H_1, H_2\}$ such that

$$\mathcal{H}_2(M_b) = \begin{cases} H_1 = \{(), (0), (00), \dots, (0 \dots 0)\} = \mathcal{X}^0 \cup \left\{\mathbf{x} \in \cup_{j=1}^{t-1}\mathcal{X}^j : \sum_{j=1}^{l_\mathbf{x}} x_j = 0\right\} \\ H_2 = H \setminus H_1 \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

and the vector of parameters (π_f, π_r) is represented in our notation as $\mathbf{p}_{\mathcal{H}_2(M_b)} = (p_{H_1}, p_{H_2})$.

In Farcomeni (2011) is also shown that many other models proposed in the literature such as model M_0, M_{c_k}, $M_{c_k b}$, M_t can be recovered as special cases of model with saturated parameterization $\mathbf{p}$ subject to specific linear constraints. In the following we prefer to index parameters with the partition notation and we refer to the reduced parametrization with the symbol $\mathbf{p}_{\mathcal{H}_B} = (p_{H_1}, \dots, p_{H_B})$ corresponding to the uniquely identified conditional probabilities associated to the partition $\mathcal{H}_B$.

We now briefly provide details on two other meaningful partitions corresponding to Markovian models of order 1 and 2 respectively. They will be used and clarified more extensively in the next section. In the generic model M_{c_k}, for each unit, capture probability at some stage j depends only on the capture status of the unit in the previous k occasions. More formally, for $k = 1$ we have that in order to uniquely specify the corresponding Markovian model we need to specify two probability parameters $\pi_{(0)} \in [0, 1]$ and $\pi_{(1)} \in [0, 1]$ and set

$$M_{c_1} : \begin{cases} p(X_{ij} = 1 | x_{ij-1} = 0) = \pi_{(0)}, & \forall i = 1, \dots N \ \forall j = 1, \dots t \\ p(X_{ij} = 1 | x_{ij-1} = 1) = \pi_{(1)}, & \forall i = 1, \dots N \ \forall j = 2, \dots t \end{cases}$$

while for $k = 2$ we need to fix four parameters $\pi_{(00)}$, $\pi_{(01)}$, $\pi_{(10)}$ and $\pi_{(11)}$ and set

$$M_{c_2} : \begin{cases} Pr(X_{ij} = 1 | x_{ij-2} = 0, x_{ij-1} = 0) = \pi_{(00)}, & \forall i = 1, \dots N \ \forall j = 1, \dots t \\ Pr(X_{ij} = 1 | x_{ij-2} = 0, x_{ij-1} = 1) = \pi_{(01)}, & \forall i = 1, \dots N \ \forall j = 2, \dots t \\ Pr(X_{ij} = 1 | x_{ij-2} = 1, x_{ij-1} = 0) = \pi_{(10)}, & \forall i = 1, \dots N \ \forall j = 3, \dots t \\ Pr(X_{ij} = 1 | x_{ij-2} = 1, x_{ij-1} = 1) = \pi_{(11)}, & \forall i = 1, \dots N \ \forall j = 3, \dots t \end{cases}$$

For notational consistency we clarify that for $k = 1, 2$ if $j - k \leq 0$ the conditioning events related to x_{ij-k} are dropped. Indeed for the initial events in M_{c_1} we conventionally assume that there has been no capture before the first occasion i.e. $p_1() \equiv Pr(x_{i1} = 1) = p_2(0) = \pi_{(0)}$ while in M_{c_2} we conventionally assume that $p_1() \equiv Pr(x_{i1} = 1) = p_3(00) = \pi_{(00)}$ and also $p_2(0) \equiv Pr(x_{i2} = 1 | x_{i1} = 0) = p_3(00) = \pi_{(00)}$ and $p_1(1) \equiv Pr(x_{i2} = 1 | x_{i1} = 1) = p_3(01) = \pi_{(01)}$. In the specific case where $t = 5$ the above Markovian models correspond to the following partitions: for the first order we have

$$\mathcal{H}_2(M_{c_1}) = \begin{cases} H_1 = \{(), (0), (00), (10), (000), (100), (010), (110), \\ \qquad (0000), (0100), (0010), (0110), (1000), (1100), (1010), (1110)\} \\ H_2 = \{(1), (01), (11), (001), (101), (011), (111), \\ \qquad (0001), (0011), (0101), (0111), (1001), (1011), (1101)(1111)\} \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

and for the second order

$$\mathcal{H}_4(M_{c_2}) = \begin{cases} H_1 = \{(), (0), (00), (000), (100), (0000), (0100), (1000), (1100)\} \\ H_2 = \{(10), (010), (110), (0010), (0110), (1010), (1110)\} \\ H_3 = \{(1), (01), (001), (101), (0001), (0101), (1001), (1101)\} \\ H_4 = \{(11), (011), (111), (0011), (0111), (1011), (1111)\} \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

There are many other new models which can be derived from this partition-based approach and some very simple examples are detailed in the Supplementary Web Materials (S1). Unfortunately, the number of all possible models is exponentially growing with t, namely with the Bell number of $2^t - 1$, with more than 10^{25} alternatives when there are only $t = 5$ capture occasions. Indeed, hardly all possible partitions lead to interesting behavioral patterns or meaningful models.

In the following section we will introduce our main idea of defining a quantification of the partial capture history to be used as a covariate within a generalized linear model framework. Not only can this covariate be used in its own right to define new parsimonious and meaningful behavioural models but it can also be used to partition the whole set of conditional probabilities into equivalence classes recovering many existing models as well as generating new meaningful ones.

3. A new meaningful behavioural covariate approach

Similarly to Huggins (1989) and Alho (1990), we consider a logistic regression model viewing each capture occurrence of unit i at occasion j as a binary outcome whose probability can be modelled as a function of an explanatory variable z_{ij}. Our idea is to build up and exploit a synthetic unidimensional $z_{ij} = q(x_{i1}, \dots, x_{ij-1}) \in \Re$ associated to the previous partial capture history. Formally this can be embedded as follows

$$\text{logit}\left(p_j(x_{i1}, \dots x_{ij-1})\right) \equiv \log\left(\frac{Pr(X_{ij} = 1 | x_{i1}, \dots x_{ij-1})}{1 - Pr(X_{ij} = 1 | x_{i1}, \dots x_{ij-1})}\right) = r(q(x_1, \dots x_{j-1})) = r(z_{ij}) \tag{5}$$

To begin with we consider a simple linear logistic regression for the probability of each capture event X_{ij},

$$\text{logit}\left(p_j(x_{i1},\dots x_{ij-1})\right)=\alpha+\beta z_{ij}\qquad \forall i=1,\dots N\ \forall j=1,\dots t \tag{6}$$

where z_{ij} is a suitable numeric summary or quantification of a generic partial capture history $(x_{i1}\dots,x_{ij-1})$. To simplify the notation the unit index i will be omitted in the following when it is not needed. Remind that a partial capture history $\mathbf{x}=(x_1,\dots,x_r)$ is a binary string taking values in $H=\cup_{r=0}^{t-1}\mathcal{X}^r$ and has a length $l_{\mathbf{x}}=r$ which can take values in $0,1,...,t-1$. Any partial capture history can be transformed into an integer number z using the string as its binary representation and, after providing some detail on this transformation, we will explain why this can be thought of as a meaningful behavioural covariate. According to the natural and intuitive interpretation of grading a behavioural effect so that the occurrence of trapping in the last occasions has a greater impact on the future capture probability than those occurred in the previous ones we proceed to appropriately reverse the usual binary representation of integers and consider the following transform

$$f(\mathbf{x})=f(x_1,\dots,x_{l_{\mathbf{x}}})=\sum_{j=1}^{l_{\mathbf{x}}}x_j2^{j-1}\in\{0,1,2,...,2^{l_{\mathbf{x}}}-1\}$$

where we assume that the partial capture history has length $l_{\mathbf{x}}\geq 1$. Conventionally, we set $f(\mathbf{x})=0$ for the empty binary sequence of length zero corresponding to $\mathbf{x}=()$. However, note that the mapping $\mathbf{x}\mapsto f(\mathbf{x})$ spans a different range of integers $[0,2^{l_{\mathbf{x}}}-1]$ according to the length $l_{\mathbf{x}}$ of the binary string $\mathbf{x}$. Hence, in order to obtain a potentially continuous covariate in a fixed range to be used as a synthetic representation of the past history we rescale the range in the unit interval by simply dividing $f(\mathbf{x})$ by $2^{l_{\mathbf{x}}}-1$ and get our proposed numerical covariate z

$$z\quad=\quad g(x_1,\dots,x_{l_{\mathbf{x}}})=g(\mathbf{x})=\frac{f(\mathbf{x})}{2^{l_{\mathbf{x}}}-1}\in\left\{0,\frac{1}{2^{l_{\mathbf{x}}}-1},\frac{2}{2^{l_{\mathbf{x}}}-1},...,1\right\} \tag{7}$$

From now on we will pretend that z is a continuous time-varying covariate. As a matter of fact the function $g(\mathbf{x})$ has a finite-discrete range. However, if we extend $\mathbf{x}$ to be a possibly infinite sequence we have that $\{g(\mathbf{x}):\mathbf{x}\in H\}$ corresponds to the set of dyadic rationals in $[0,1]$ which is a dense subset in $[0,1]$.

At first sight this may be thought of only as a technical mathematical device, but it can be easily argued that the ordering induced by this quantization of the previous binary history is sensible. To begin with, the transformation $g(\mathbf{x})$ introduces a meaningful ordering of partial capture histories. In fact one can argue that in the process of learning from the past experience a capture occurrence (1 digit) in the very last occasion (last position of the binary string) can affect the individual behaviour with a greater impact than a capture in the previous occasions. Moreover, the more the capture occurrence (1 digits) in the partial capture history the greater the impact. Of course we are not claiming the necessity of such ordering but we are explaining how it can be reasonably and fairly interpreted. Even though there is no compelling argument for the corresponding quantization it can be considered a convenient starting point to be refined further with alternative suitable data-driven rescaling such as the one in (7) or other transformations. In this sense it can be given a plausibly realistic interpretation as a standardized quantization of the past experience or the accumulation of practice/memory/training with respect to the previously occurred events. We will illustrate its usefulness to model behavioural effects in a capture-recapture context.

Considering the partial capture histories corresponding to the capture occurrences in $\mathbf{X}=[x_{ij}]$ and the function $g:H\to[0,1]$ as in (7) one can derive a covariate matrix $\mathbf{Z}=[z_{ij}]$ as

TABLE 1. *Quantization of all partial capture histories corresponding to the complete individual capture history* $(0,0,1,0,0,1,1,0,0,1)$ *in a capture-recapture experiment with* $t = 10$ *capture occasions*

Time j	**Current occurrence** x_{ij}	**Partial capture history** $(x_{i1}, \ldots, x_{ij-1})$	**Numeric covariate** z_{ij}
1	0	( )	0.000
2	0	(0)	0.000 = 0/1
3	1	(0 , 0)	0.000 = 0/3
4	0	(0 , 0 , 1)	0.571 = 4/7
5	0	(0 , 0 , 1 , 0)	0.267 = 4/15
6	1	(0 , 0 , 1 , 0 , 0)	0.129 = 4/31
7	1	(0 , 0 , 1 , 0 , 0 , 1)	0.571 = 36/63
8	0	(0 , 0 , 1 , 0 , 0 , 1 , 1)	0.787 = 100/127
9	0	(0 , 0 , 1 , 0 , 0 , 1 , 1 , 0)	0.392 = 100/255
10	1	(0 , 0 , 1 , 0 , 0 , 1 , 1 , 0 , 0)	0.196 = 100/511

follows

$$z_{ij} = g(x_{i1}, \ldots, x_{ij-1}) \quad \forall i = 1, \ldots, N \, ; \, \forall j = 1, \ldots, t.$$

Notice that the first column of $\mathbf{Z}$ corresponds to a null column since, for $j = 1$, the partial history $\mathbf{x} = (x_{i1}, \ldots x_{ij-1})$ corresponds in fact to an empty history ($\mathbf{x} = ()$).
We now show in practice how the covariate mapping $\mathbf{x} \mapsto z$ works. Consider the following complete capture history in a capture-recapture setting with $t = 10$ trapping occasions:

$$(x_{i1}, \ldots, x_{i10}) \; = \; (0,0,1,0,0,1,1,0,0,1)$$

We derive all the quantizations corresponding to all partial capture histories in Table 1 In our capture-recapture analysis we will use z_{ij} as an individual covariate changing with time j. For implementation purposes, both $\mathbf{X}$ and $\mathbf{Z}$ can be vectorized considering each double index ij as a label for a single binary outcome x_{ij} whose probability can be explained in terms of the corresponding covariate z_{ij}. In the following we will start considering a simple linear logistic model as in (6) but other more flexible models can be adopted such as polynomial logistic regression, splines, step functions etc. Notice that, differently from the usual covariates observable in a capture-recapture context during the experiment (sex, age, length, etc.) we do know the values of the z's also for the unobserved units. In fact, considering that units observed are labelled from 1 to M and those not observed are labelled from $M + 1$ to N we have $z_{ij} = 0$ for all $i = M + 1, \ldots N$ and for all $j = 1, \ldots, t$. We remark that other partial history orderings and mappings can be considered sensible and useful in real data applications such as those based on the absolute or relative number of events experienced previously than time j. The reason why we are particularly interested in the ordering induced by $g(\mathbf{x})$ as in (7) is that it is a rather flexible device which can be also used to reproduce and flexibly modulate a Markov structure of arbitrary order. We will explain in detail the relationship between the continuous covariate z and the Markovian structure in subsection 3.1. We briefly illustrate alternative quantization of past experience in subsection 3.2.
Finally notice that considering a numeric covariate z built as described in (7) and a generic linear logistic regression model as in (6) the first capture probabilities turn out to be equal to $p_1() = p_2(0) = p_3(0,0) = \cdots = p_t(0, \ldots, 0) = e^{\alpha}/(1 + e^{\alpha})$ and depend only on the parameter α while β affects only the recapture probabilities which are indeed different according to the different size of the memory effect as recorded by z. This kind of model can then be considered

an extension of the standard behavioral model M_b. Moreover the probability P_0 of never being captured during the whole experiment is

$$P_0 = \left(1 - \frac{e^{\alpha}}{1+e^{\alpha}}\right)^t$$

and depends only on one parameter as in model M_b. Note however that, differently from M_b, also the recapture probabilities depend on α and this is the reason why the two models end up with different estimates of P_0 and N. In fact in Alunni Fegatelli and Tardella (2013) it is highlighted that all behavioural models for which the first equivalence class H_1 is composed exclusively by all partial capture histories with no capture yield the same unconditional likelihood factor involving only N and p_{H_1} and they yield the same estimates for N. For further details see Supplementary Web Materials (S1).

3.1. **Covariate representation and Markovian structure.** In this subsection we go back to the topic of building behavioural models based on meaningful partitions of the subset H as in Section 2. We will show how the numeric covariate z can be *also* used to set up meaningful partitions of H and how one can recover those partitions corresponding to Markovian models. If we fix a positive integer $k < t$ we can partition the set H of all partial capture histories according to the value of $g(\mathbf{x})$ into appropriate subintervals namely $I_1 = \left[0, \frac{1}{2^k}\right]$, ... , $I_r = \left(\frac{r-1}{2^k}, \frac{r}{2^k}\right]$, $I_{r+1} = \left(\frac{r}{2^k}, \frac{r+1}{2^k}\right]$, ... , $I_{2^k} = \left(\frac{2^k-1}{2^k}, 1\right]$. Hence we get the partition $H = \{H_1, \ldots, H_{2^k}\}$ where

$$\mathbf{x} \in H_r \;\Leftrightarrow\; z = g(\mathbf{x}) \in I_r \quad \forall\, r \in \{1, \ldots, 2^k\} \tag{8}$$

so that the equivalence classes of binary subsequences depend only on the last k binary events. In fact one can formally show that the mapping g defined in (7) is such that, for each partial capture history $\mathbf{x} \in H$, $z = g(\mathbf{x})$ belongs to the same set I_r according to the last k digits of the binary sequence. Hence the definition of equivalence classes of conditional probabilities given partial capture histories in these partitions satisfy the Markov property of order k. The formal proof is provided in Supplementary Web Materials (S2) with further details on ensuring the appropriate correspondence of partitions $H_1, ..., H_{2^k}$ with I_1,...,I_{2^k} deriving from (8) also for partial capture histories with less than k digits.

We highlight that the partition defined in (8) is equivalent to considering a general logistic regression as in (5) where the function $r(z)$ is a real step-function $s(z)$ which is constant over each subinterval I_r as follows

$$s(z) = logit(p_{H_r}) \qquad z \in I_r \qquad \forall r = 1, ..., 2^k$$

where $p_{H_r} = P(X_{ij} = 1 | x_{i1}, \ldots, x_{ij-1}))$ for any $(x_{i1}, \ldots, x_{ij-1}) \in H_r$ according to the notation used in Section 2. Notice that in the logistic regression setup this is equivalent to convert the numerical covariate into a categorical factor according to which subinterval I_r the covariate falls in.

In order to get it straight we illustrate the first order Markov case with $k = 1$ and the corresponding two subintervals $I_1 = \left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right]$, $I_2 = \left(\frac{1}{2}, 1\right]$ which divide the unit interval representing the support of the variable z. From (8) we get the partition of the set H of all partial capture histories considered in the particular case with $t = 5$ as in Table 2. The bipartition obtained is exactly the same as (3) introduced in the previous section. More details and examples of the correspondence are included in the Supplementary Web Materials (S2).

3.2. **Alternative covariate partitioning and alternative meaningful behavioural covariates.** We now sketch a list of other meaningful alternatives for partitioning the *covariate range*. Indeed, it is possible to recover model M_b associated to the partition $\mathcal{H}_2(M_b)$ by partitioning the support of $z = g(\mathbf{x})$ as follows $I_1 = \left[0, \frac{1}{2^t}\right]$, $I_2 = \left(\frac{1}{2^t}, 1\right]$ so that it can be recovered in

TABLE 2. *Capture-recapture experiment with $t = 5$ capture occasions: list of all the possible partial capture histories ($\mathbf{x}$) and their corresponding numerical covariates ($g(\mathbf{x})$) with relative subintervals for Markov models of order $k = 1$ and $k = 2$*

$\mathbf{x}$	$g(\mathbf{x})$	**Partition interval** ($k = 1$)	**Partition interval** ($k = 2$)	$\mathbf{x}$	$g(\mathbf{x})$	**Partition interval** ($k = 1$)	**Partition interval** ($k = 2$)
()	0	$[0, 0.5]$	$[0, 0.25]$	(0)	0	$[0, 0.5]$	$[0, 0.25]$
(1)	1	$(0.5, 1]$	$(0.75, 1]$	(00)	0	$[0, 0.5]$	$[0, 0.25]$
(10)	0.333	$[0, 0.5]$	$(0.25, 0.5]$	(01)	0.667	$(0.5, 1]$	$(0.5, 0.75]$
(11)	1	$(0.5, 1]$	$(0.75, 1]$	(000)	0	$[0, 0.5]$	$[0, 0.25]$
(100)	0.143	$[0, 0.5]$	$[0, 0.25]$	(010)	0.286	$[0, 0.5]$	$(0.25, 0.5]$
(110)	0.429	$[0, 0.5]$	$(0.25, 0.5]$	(001)	0.571	$(0.5, 1]$	$(0.5, 0.75]$
(101)	0.714	$(0.5, 1]$	$(0.5, 0.75]$	(011)	0.857	$(0.5, 1]$	$(0.75, 1]$
(111)	1	$(0.5, 1]$	$(0.75, 1]$	(0000)	0	$[0, 0.5]$	$[0, 0.25]$
(1000)	0.067	$[0, 0.5]$	$[0, 0.25]$	(0100)	0.133	$[0, 0.5]$	$[0, 0.25]$
(1100)	0.200	$[0, 0.5]$	$[0, 0.25]$	(0010)	0.267	$[0, 0.5]$	$(0.25, 0.5]$
(1010)	0.333	$[0, 0.5]$	$(0.25, 0.5]$	(0110)	0.400	$[0, 0.5]$	$(0.25, 0.5]$
(1110)	0.467	$[0, 0.5]$	$(0.25, 0.5]$	(0001)	0.533	$(0.5, 1]$	$(0.5, 0.75]$
(1001)	0.600	$(0.5, 1]$	$(0.5, 0.75]$	(0101)	0.667	$(0.5, 1]$	$(0.5, 0.75]$
(1101)	0.733	$(0.5, 1]$	$(0.5, 0.75]$	(0011)	0.800	$(0.5, 1]$	$(0.75, 1]$
(1011)	0.867	$(0.5, 1]$	$(0.75, 1]$	(0111)	0.933	$(0.5, 1]$	$(0.75, 1]$
(1111)	1	$(0.5, 1]$	$(0.75, 1]$				

terms of the logistic regression with step function defined as $s(z) = logit(p_{H_1}) = logit(p)$ when $z \in I_1$ and $s(z) = logit(p_{H_2}) = logit(r)$ when $z \in I_2$. The upper bound of $I_1 = \left[0, \frac{1}{2^t}\right]$ is chosen conveniently low in order to get the same partition $\mathcal{H}_2(M_b)$. In fact, the presence of at least one capture in a partial capture history $\mathbf{x}$ makes the corresponding $g(\mathbf{x}) \geq 1/2^{t-1} > 1/2^t$. Notice that since $1/2^t > 0$ the first partition I_1 can be equivalently reduced to the single value $\{0\}$ or any other interval $[0, e_1]$ provided that $e_1 \leq 1/2^t$. This is basically due to the discreteness of the observable range.

More generally, an alternative partition of the range of z into A consecutive subintervals $I_1 = [0, e_1]$, ..., $I_a = (e_{a-1}, e_a]$, ..., $I_A = (e_{A-1}, 1]$ represents a meaningful behavioural model corresponding to the regression step function

$$s(z) = logit(p_{H_a}) \qquad \forall z \in I_a \qquad a = 1, \dots A.$$

This particularly flexible instance of partitioning the range of the behavioural covariate $g(\mathbf{x})$ embeds some of the original models proposed in Farcomeni (2011) such as M_{L_2} (Supplementary Web Materials, S1 and S3). In fact looking for an appropriate number and location of the partition cuts e_a in terms of step functions for the logistic regression can readily explore a range of meaningful variable order Markov chain models. We will exploit this approach in our applications.

As already mentioned the most critical parameter for the estimation of N is the probability P_0 as in (1). Indeed when we partition the set of conditional probabilities through partitioning the quantification $z = g(\mathbf{x})$ into intervals I_1, ... , I_A we have that, as long as $g(\mathbf{x}) \in I_1 = [0, e_1]$ (and this is certainly true for all partial capture histories with no capture) we get

$$p_j(0, \dots, 0) = p_{H1} \qquad \forall j = 1, ..., t-1$$

so that the fundamental probability $P_0 = \left[(1 - p_1()) \prod_{j=2}^{t} (1 - p_j(0, \dots, 0))\right] = (1 - p_{H_1})^t$ depends on a single element (first component) of the parameter vector $\mathbf{p}_{H_A}$.

As previously highlighted, the procedure of ordering and scaling a generic partial capture history defined in (7) is not the only way of representing the quantization of a binary sequence. Indeed, although we have argued why our choice of $g(\mathbf{x})$ can be considered reasonable in some cases (also in terms of Markovian structure) it can be open to some criticism. For example, consider the following two partial capture histories each based on five capture occasions

$$\mathbf{x}_1 = (1,1,1,1,0) \quad \Rightarrow \quad g(\mathbf{x}_1) = \frac{1\cdot 2^0 + 1\cdot 2^1 + 1\cdot 2^2 + 1\cdot 2^3 + 0\cdot 2^4}{2^5-1} = \frac{15}{31} = 0.484$$
$$\mathbf{x}_2 = (0,0,0,0,1) \quad \Rightarrow \quad g(\mathbf{x}_2) = \frac{0\cdot 2^0 + 0\cdot 2^1 + 0\cdot 2^2 + 0\cdot 2^3 + 1\cdot 2^4}{2^5-1} = \frac{16}{31} = 0.516$$

The first partial capture history $\mathbf{x}_1$ has a total of four captures in the first four occasions while the second one $\mathbf{x}_2$ has only one capture in the last occasion. The mapping $g(\cdot)$ described in (7) assigns a larger impact on the conditional probabilities to $\mathbf{x}_2$. One can find undesirable the fact that the partial capture history $\mathbf{x}_1$ having just a single capture, even though in the last occasion, yields a larger value compared to a binary sequence which has 4 captures out of 5.
As a possible alternative useful mapping one can consider a function based on the *total* number of captures occurred for each partial capture history $\mathbf{x} \in H$. In order to obtain a potentially continuous covariate as in (7) we rescale the range in the unit interval considering as denominator the length of each capture history as follows

$$z = g_n(\mathbf{x}) = g_n(x_1,\ldots,x_{l_\mathbf{x}}) = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{l_\mathbf{x}} x_j}{l_\mathbf{x}} \in \left\{0, \frac{1}{l_\mathbf{x}}, \frac{2}{l_\mathbf{x}}, ..., 1\right\} \tag{9}$$

The partial capture histories $\mathbf{x}_1$ and $\mathbf{x}_2$ can be quantified as in (9) yielding $\mathbf{x}_1 = (1,1,1,1,0) \mapsto \frac{4}{5} = 0.8$ and $\mathbf{x}_2 = (0,0,0,0,1) \mapsto \frac{1}{5} = 0.2$. It is also possible to rescale the number of captures by considering the total number of occasions in the whole experiment as follows

$$z = \tilde{g}_n(\mathbf{x}) = \tilde{g}_n(x_1,\ldots,x_{l_\mathbf{x}}) = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{l_\mathbf{x}} x_j}{t} \in \left\{0, \frac{1}{t-1}, \frac{2}{t-1}, ..., 1\right\} \tag{10}$$

On the other hand the mapping g_n and $\tilde{g}_n$ described in (9) and (10) may have in turn their own undesirable features. In fact they do not take into account the inner sequence structure considering the number of captures only. For example a partial capture history (1,0,0,0,0) will be equivalent in terms of g_n and $\tilde{g}_n$ to $\mathbf{x}_2$ even though they may be considered substantially different.

4. Unconditional maximum likelihood inference

In this section we show how our new approach exploiting a numerical summary of partial capture histories and a logistic regression framework yields a simple-to-implement procedure to infer on the parameter space through the unconditional likelihood and, as a by-product, inference on the main parameter of interest N using the profile likelihood. Indeed we will basically recycle consolidated standard GLM routines in our capture-recapture context. Let $L(N,\alpha,\beta)$ be the likelihood function for the linear logistic model (5) such that

$$L(N,\alpha,\beta) \propto \binom{N}{M}\left[\prod_{i=1}^{N}\prod_{j=1}^{t}\left(\frac{\exp(\alpha+\beta z_{ij})}{1+\exp(\alpha+\beta z_{ij})}\right)^{x_{ij}}\left(1-\frac{\exp(\alpha+\beta z_{ij})}{1+\exp(\alpha+\beta z_{ij})}\right)^{1-x_{ij}}\right] \tag{11}$$

In order to make inference on N one can first look at $L(N,\alpha,\beta)$ as a function of (α,β) only for a fixed value of N. Let us denote with

$$\hat{L}(N) = L(N,\hat{\alpha}(N),\hat{\beta}(N)) = \sup_{\alpha,\beta} L(N,\alpha,\beta)$$

the maximum likelihood of (α, β) obtained as a result of a standard logistic model fitted using $N \times t$ binary observations x_{ij} with their corresponding numerical covariates z_{ij}. Unconditional maximum likelihood estimate for N will then be

$$\hat{N} = \arg \max_{N \in \{M, \ldots, N_{upp}\}} \left(\hat{L}(N) \right)$$

where N_{upp} is a suitably high fixed upperbound for the population size. The joint unconditional likelihood for all parameters involved in the model is globally maximized at the UMLE value $(\hat{N}, \hat{\alpha}(\hat{N}), \hat{\beta}(\hat{N}))$. Hence the estimating procedure for obtaining maximum of the unconditional likelihood function $L(N, \alpha, \beta)$ requires to iteratively fit a logistic regression for each $N \in \{M, \ldots, N_{upp}\}$. For very large values of N_{upp} this procedure can be computationally demanding and time-consuming involving logistic procedures repeated $N_{upp} - M + 1$ times. To reduce computational effort and computing time it is possible to group observed results according to the same value of the covariate such as those corresponding to unobserved units and implement GLM routines for weighted data. Moreover, one can evaluate the profile likelihood function not at each single value of $N \in \{M, \ldots, N_{upp}\}$ but only on a suitable sub grid and use some parallel computing environment to run simultaneously multiple logistic fits. Standard GLM routines also allow to fit more flexible models incorporating unobserved heterogeneity adding on a logit scale an individual random effect to the probability of the longitudinal series of t binary outcomes.

5. Examples

Great Copper Butterflies. As a first example we will consider the Great Copper data originally analyzed in Ramsey and Severns (2010) and also reviewed in Farcomeni (2011) and Alunni Fegatelli and Tardella (2013). There are $t = 8$ capture occasions and $M = 45$ observed butterflies. Ramsey and Severns (2010) explain that butterflies tend to congregate near favorable habitat, which is readily recognized by the observer and this may yield a persistence related to the characteristics of the subject animals, the environment and/or the observational pattern. In the first attempt to model and understand the dependence structure in the data Ramsey and Severns (2010) show how there can be a great impact of the modelled temporal dependence and behavioural pattern on the final estimates with possible large uncertainty on the magnitude of the population size. In fact Farcomeni (2011) and Alunni Fegatelli and Tardella (2013) provided evidence of alternative ephemeral effects which correspond to possibly larger population estimates. We now show the ability of the behavioral covariate approach to improve model fit and gain an alternative simple parsimonious understanding of the dependence pattern. From the maximization of the unconditional likelihood we get the results displayed in Table 3 where models are ranked according to the increasing value of the AIC. We have considered as competing models a linear logistic model as in (6) with $z = g(\mathbf{x})$ denoted with M_z and, with similar notation, linear logistic models $M_{z_{g_n}}$, M_{z_f} and $M_{z_{\tilde{g}_n}}$ with, respectively, $z = g_n(\mathbf{x})$, $z = f(\mathbf{x})$ and $z = \tilde{g}_n(\mathbf{x})$. Moreover, model $M_{c_k b}$ is a k-th order Markovian model with a specific first capture probability which differs from the recapture probability conditioned on the absence of capture in the last k occasions (see also Supplementary Web Materials (S1)).

From results displayed in Table 3 it is apparent that the use of the behavioural covariate $z = g(\mathbf{x})$ allows for a sensible improvement of the AIC which is however accompanied by a larger point estimate and width of the confidence interval. More precisely, model M_z yields $\hat{N} = 170$, with $\hat{\alpha} = -3.243$ $\hat{\beta} = 3.179$. A significantly positive $\hat{\beta}$ (p-value $< 10^{-10}$) highlights an initial trap-happiness effect which tends to diminish when the memory effect covariate $z = g(\mathbf{x})$ decreases.

We have also implemented the idea of partitioning the range of the meaningful covariate in order to look for further improvements. In fact one can see from Table 3 that, although we

TABLE 3. *Great Copper Butterfly data: point and interval estimates together with AIC index of alternative fitted models. Confidence intervals at level* $1-\alpha = 0.95$. *We note that model* $M_{z.cut(1)}$ *corresponding to the optimal single cut* $e_1^* = 0.625$ *corresponds to model* M_{L_2} *described in Farcomeni (2011)*

Model	**# parameters**	$\hat{N}$	(N^-, N^+)	**AIC**
M_z	1+2	170	(87,448)	321.46
$M_{z.cut(4)}$	1+5	62	(48,223)	321.54
$M_{z.cut(3)}$	1+4	62	(48,223)	321.62
$M_{z.cut(2)}$	1+3	176	(78,243)	323.36
$M_{c_2 b}$	1+5	62	(48,223)	325.46
$M_{z_{g_n}}$	1+2	154	(82,367)	325.99
$M_{z.cut(1)}$	1+2	90	(63,152)	326.01
M_{c_2}	1+4	176	(78,896)	327.20
M_{c_1}	1+2	97	(64,181)	330.93
$M_{c_1 b}$	1+3	62	(48,223)	331.24
$M_{z_{\bar{g}_n}}$	1+2	96	(62,184)	338.30
M_0	1+1	64	(53,85)	342.80
M_{z_f}	1+2	68	(54,97)	343.77
M_b	1+2	62	(48,223)	344.77
M_t	1+8	64	(52,84)	352.85

were not able to improve the AIC of M_z, the best model we could fit looking for an appropriate number of optimal cutpoints (ranging from 1 to 4) is $M_{z.cut(4)}$. Model $M_{z.cut(4)}$ corresponds to the partition of the covariate $z = g(\mathbf{x})$ with $I_1 = [0, 1/2^8]$, $I_2 = (1/2^8, 0.250]$, $I_3 = (0.254, 0.571]$, $I_4 = (0.571, 0.857]$, $I_5 = (0.857, 1]$. Notice that the first interval I_1 determines the same first partition subset H_1 of the partition $\mathcal{H}_2(M_b)$ in (2) corresponding to the classical behavioural model. In this case, as already argued in Alunni Fegatelli and Tardella (2013), the unconditional MLE yields the same estimate for N in both models although with a very different AIC index. For the conditional probability parameter estimates we get $\hat{p}_{H_1} = 0.147$, $\hat{p}_{H_2} = 0.024$, $\hat{p}_{H_3} = 0.134$, $\hat{p}_{H_4} = 0.273$ and $\hat{p}_{H_5} = 0.500$. This pattern as well as that resulting from M_z could be interpreted as an initial trap-happiness response (from $\hat{p}_{H_1}$ to $\hat{p}_{H_5}$) followed by decreasing recapture probabilities ($\hat{p}_{H_5} < \hat{p}_{H_4} < \hat{p}_{H_3} < \hat{p}_{H_2} < \hat{p}_{H_1}$) vanishing with the decreasing memory effect corresponding to the covariate z.

These results show that, although the enduring effect of the classical behavioural model yields one of the worst fitting models, a novel mixed ephemeral-enduring behavioral effect is highlighted by modelling the subsequent changes in the longitudinal pattern of capture probabilities after the first capture by means of our meaningful behavioural covariate $z = g(\mathbf{x})$. This model could confirm a kind of persistence effect conjectured by Ramsey and Severns (2010) although there may remain some doubts on the ability of detecting the right longitudinal pattern with so few captured individuals during a moderate number of trapping occasions. This issue will be addressed in Section 6.

Giant Day Geckos. The giant day gecko (Phelsuma madagascariensis grandis) is a tropical reptile living in areas of tropical and subtropical forest in northern Madagascar. A capture-recapture sampling on the giant day gecko has been conducted in the Masoala rainforest exhibit at the Zurich Zoo and the resulting data have been analyzed in Wanger *et al.* (2009). Due to the high number of capture occasions ($t = 30$) it can be considered an unusually good dataset where the closed population assumption is valid since it is a captive population. We are interested in

analyzing behavioural patterns possibly originated by feed habits of the geckos and/or by the human presence. More details on the sampling process can be found in Wanger *et al.* (2009). In Table 4 we list the results obtained by fitting a collection of standard models as well as new models based on both the originally proposed $g(\mathbf{x})$ and $g_n(\mathbf{x})$. With this data set we found that the alternative behavioural covariate $z = g_n(\mathbf{x})$ based on the number of previous captures as defined in (9) allows to achieve a better fit. In this example the AIC index highlights a different kind of behavioural response selecting as best model $M_{z_{g_n}.cut(3)}$ which partitions with three cutpoints the behavioural covariate range in four subintervals $[0, 0.05]$, $(0.05, 0.1579]$, $(0.1579, 0.625]$ and $(0.625, 1]$ with corresponding conditional probability estimates $\hat{p}_{H_1} = 0.034$, $\hat{p}_{H_2} = 0.061$, $\hat{p}_{H_3} = 0.159$ and $\hat{p}_{H_4} = 0.375$. The optimal cuts have been determined by a grid search as detailed in the Supplementary Web Materials (S3).

TABLE 4. *Giant Day Gecko data: point and interval estimates together with AIC index of alternative fitted models. Confidence intervals at level* $1-\alpha = 0.95$. *Linear logistic models as in* (6) *with* $z = g(\mathbf{x})$ *is denoted with* M_z*; with* $z = g_n(\mathbf{x})$ *is denoted with* $M_{z_{g_n}}$. *Model* $M_{c_k b}$ *are* k*-th order Markovian models with a specific first capture probability which differs from the re-capture probability conditioned on the absence of capture in the last* k *occasions*

Model	**# parameters**	$\hat{N}$	(N^-, N^+)	**AIC**
$M_{z_{g_n}.cut(3)}$	4+1	105	(83,154)	1108.76
$M_{z_{g_n}.cut(2)}$	3+1	89	(77,108)	1110.80
$M_{z_{g_n}.cut(1)}$	2+1	89	(77,108)	1114.81
$M_{z_{g_n}}$	2+1	86	(76,101)	1126.36
$M_{z_{\bar{g}_n}}$	2+1	87	(76,105)	1141.09
M_z	2+1	80	(73,91)	1147.36
$M_{c_2 b}$	5+2	107	(79,266)	1150.25
$M_{c_1 b}$	3+1	107	(79,266)	1153.18
M_{c_2}	4+1	79	(72,89)	1154.70
M_b	2+1	107	(79,266)	1155.73
M_{c_1}	2+1	76	(71,85)	1160.32
M_t	30+1	74	(70,81)	1164.72
M_0	1+1	74	(70,82)	1166.18
M_{z_f}	2+1	75	(70,82)	1166.88

6. A simulation study for model selection

In this section a simulation study is developed in order to evaluate and compare the performance among alternative classical (M_0, M_b, M_t, M_{c_1}, $M_{c_1 b}$, M_{c_2} and $M_{c_2 b}$) and new (M_z, $M_{z_{g_n}}$, M_{z_f} and $M_{z_{\bar{g}_n}}$) models based on four meaningful behavioural covariates.

Motivated by the real data results we decided to focus on models M_z and $M_{z_{g_n}}$ which represent different aspects of the behavioural effect to capture. We use either one as generating data model with the same parameter settings ($\alpha = -3$ and $\beta = 4$) considering different values for the population size and the number of occasions: $N \in \{100, 200\}$ and $t \in \{10, 20, 30\}$ respectively. Notice that, taking the same value of t the probability P_0 of never being observed will be the same in both models and taking the same N we get the same expected number $E[M]$ of distinct units captured at least once. Obviously if N and/or t increase the expected number of distinct units observed becomes larger.

For each setting described in Table 5 $K = 100$ data-set are generated and for each generated data set we calculate point and interval estimates using the unconditional likelihood approach. Moreover, the AIC index is computed in order to compare all candidate models. In Tables 6 and 7, for all the alternative models considered, we report the empirical mean and the root mean square error (RMSE) of the alternative estimates of N, empirical coverage and average length of the interval estimates and the percentage of times that each model is selected as the the best one when the AIC index is used. As we can see from the results in Tables 6 and 7 the estimates of N from the true model (M_z and $M_{z_{g_n}}$ respectively) almost always yield best results in terms of both point and interval estimates. In correspondence of the true model the empirical mean $\bar{N}$ is very close to the real values of N and the RMSE is almost always the smallest one. Only in Trial 1 and Trial 7 the true model does not achieve the smallest RMSE. However they are the only ones which yield confidence intervals guaranteeing a coverage close to the nominal level. Finally, from the column labelled with %aic one can verify that the AIC index allows to identify the true model most of times, especially when t increases. In fact, with a long sequence the longitudinal information gathered from the experiment is high and the selection criterion is able to well distinguish among all candidates. This is still true also when alternative behavioural effects can be somehow related as in the case of higher order Markovian models and model M_z. However, when the number of capture occasions is low and the number of distinct units is not too high the available information could be not sufficient to correctly select the true model.

TABLE 5. *Description of simulation settings: in both generating models M_z and $M_{z_{g_n}}$ logistic regression parameter values were set equal to $\alpha = -3$, $\beta = 4$. The expected value of distinct observed units is denoted with $E[M]$ and can be computed as $E[M] = N(1 - P_0)$*

Trial	**Model**	N	t	$E[M]$
1	M_z	100	10	38.5
2	M_z	100	20	62.2
3	M_z	100	30	76.7
4	M_z	200	10	77.0
5	M_z	200	20	124.3
6	M_z	200	30	153.4
7	$M_{z_{g_n}}$	100	10	38.5
8	$M_{z_{g_n}}$	100	20	62.2
9	$M_{z_{g_n}}$	100	30	76.7
10	$M_{z_{g_n}}$	200	10	77.0
11	$M_{z_{g_n}}$	200	20	124.3
12	$M_{z_{g_n}}$	200	30	153.4

7. Concluding remarks and discussion

In order to model behavioural effect to capture and other possible longitudinal patterns we have proposed a flexible model framework based on the conditional probability parameterization and a suitable ordering and scaling of the binary sequences representing the individual partial capture histories. One meaningful ordering is built up through the binary representation of integers corresponding to each conditioning sequence of partial capture history. Then, the integer quantity representing the numerical quantification of a partial capture history is appropriately rescaled in order to obtain a suitable quantitative covariate z ranging in a standard interval

	Trial 1					**Trial** 2					**Trial** 3				
Model	N	**rmse**	**CI**	l_{CI}	**%aic**	N	**rmse**	**CI**	l_{CI}	**%aic**	N	**rmse**	**CI**	l_{CI}	**%aic**
M_z	109	43.0	90	187.1	75	100	13.9	95	52.6	88	99	7.6	95	29.2	95
$M_{z_{g_n}}$	75	33.9	66	78.8	2	82	20.8	47	28.8	0	87	13.9	34	16.4	0
M_{z_f}	47	53.3	1	17.1	0	67	33.4	0	8.7	0	79	21.7	0	4.6	0
$M_{z_{\bar{g}_n}}$	57	45.2	21	40.3	0	74	27.3	10	19.1	0	83	17.8	7	11.4	0
M_0	44	56.1	0	11.1	0	66	34.3	0	7.1	0	78	22.1	0	3.9	0
M_b	209*	564.0*	83	3866.0*	0	119*	105.4*	89	1776.5*	0	98	15.3	90	79.3	0
M_{c_1}	72	34.7	62	82.1	3	83	19.6	55	30.2	0	89	12.4	50	18.4	0
$M_{c_1 b}$	209*	564.0*	83	3866.0*	0	119*	105.4*	89	1776.5*	0	98	15.3	90	79.3	0
M_{c_2}	96*	46.2*	89	151.7*	14	93	15.9	86	47.0	9	94	9.1	84	25.3	4
$M_{c_2 b}$	209*	564.0*	83	3866.0*	6	119*	105.4*	89	1776.5*	3	98	15.3	90	79.3	1
M_t	44	56.4	0	10.7	0	66	34.3	0	6.9	0	78	21.7	0	3.9	0
	Trial 4					**Trial** 5					**Trial** 6				
Model	N	**rmse**	**CI**	l_{CI}	**%aic**	N	**rmse**	**CI**	l_{CI}	**%aic**	N	**rmse**	**CI**	l_{CI}	**%aic**
M_z	205	45.9	95	200.0	87	199	19.8	91	72.9	96	201	11.3	94	42.1	97
$M_{z_{g_n}}$	142	62.8	45	91.5	0	163	39.5	19	39.9	0	176	25.2	14	23.9	0
M_{z_f}	93	107.4	0	21.6	0	133	67.1	0	12.8	0	159	41.6	0	8.2	0
$M_{z_{\bar{g}_n}}$	112	90.3	7	48.5	0	146	54.5	0	26.0	0	167	33.5	1	16.9	0
M_0	88	112.8	0	14.9	0	131	68.9	0	10.9	0	158	42.5	0	7.0	0
M_b	284*	415.9*	87	3270.3*	0	218*	130.7*	93	942.1*	0	197	18.4	94	86.8	0
M_{c_1}	136	68.4	34	85.6	0	165	37.3	26	41.9	0	180	21.6	31	26.8	0
$M_{c_1 b}$	284*	415.9*	87	3270.3*	0	218*	130.7*	93	942.1*	0	197	18.4	94	86.8	0
M_{c_2}	174	53.1	85	192.2	11	183	24.7	77	62.6	1	191	13.5	82	36.2	2
$M_{c_2 b}$	284*	415.9*	87	3270.3*	2	218*	130.7*	93	942.1*	3	197	18.4	94	86.8	1
M_t	87	113.0	0	14.6	0	131	68.9	0	10.7	0	158	42.5	0	6.9	0

TABLE 6. *Simulation study with 100 simulated datasets for each simulation setting (Trial 1-6) where true generating model is M_z: empirical average ($\bar{N}$) of the point estimate $\hat{N}$, root mean square error (rmse), confidence intervals coverage (CI %), average length of the confidence intervals (l_{CI}) and percentage of times each competing model has achieved best AIC (%aic). The $*$ sign denotes the presence of likelihood failure $\hat{N} = \infty$ (Alunni Fegatelli and Tardella, 2013). We are reporting a finite rmse computed after removing those failure cases. Nominal level of the confidence interval* $1 - \alpha = 0.95$.

	Trial 7					**Trial** 8					**Trial** 9				
Model	N	**rmse**	**CI**	l_{CI}	**%aic**	N	**rmse**	**CI**	l_{CI}	**%aic**	N	**rmse**	**CI**	l_{CI}	**%aic**
M_z	91	33.3	85	129.7	3	87	17.3	71	35.5	1	90	12.0	57	19.6	0
$M_{z_{g_n}}$	109.0	42.0	90	170.7	93	100	13.5	92	52.8	99	99	7.9	93	29.3	100
M_{z_f}	49	51.3	2	21.1	0	70	30.3	2	13.4	0	82	19.2	3	9.0	0
$M_{z_{\tilde{g}_n}}$	73	36.3	60	75.9	2	84	18.8	60	32.8	0	90	12.1	59	19.7	0
M_0	48	52.4	1	17.9	1	70	30.5	2	13.0	0	82	19.1	4	8.9	0
M_b	209*	564.0*	83	3866.0*	0	119.4*	105.4*	89	1776.5*	0	98	15.3	90	193.5	0
M_{c_1}	59	42.5	29	43.2	0	76	25.4	11	20.8	0	84	16.4	16	13.1	0
$M_{c_1 b}$	209*	564.0*	83	3866.0*	0	119.4*	105.4*	89	1776.5*	0	98	15.3	90	193.5	0
M_{c_2}	69	36.4	65	84.9	1	80	22.4	38	26.9	0	86	14.8	31	15.6	0
$M_{c_2 b}$	209*	564.0*	83	3866.0*	0	119.4*	105.4*	89	1776.5*	0	98	15.3	90	193.5	0
M_t	48	52.8	1	17.4	0	70	30.7	2	12.8	0	81	19.3	3	8.7	0
	Trial 10					**Trial** 11					**Trial** 12				
Model	N	**rmse**	**CI**	l_{CI}	**%aic**	N	**rmse**	**CI**	l_{CI}	**%aic**	N	**rmse**	**CI**	l_{CI}	**%aic**
M_z	170	50.2	75	138.9	0	173	30.8	52	49.2	0	182	20.6	43	28.1	0
$M_{z_{g_n}}$	205	46.3	91	188.1	100	200	18.7	95	72.7	100	200	11.5	92	41.8	100
M_{z_f}	96	104.3	0	25.6	0	139	61.2	0	18.5	0	164	36.6	0	13.4	0
$M_{z_{\tilde{g}_n}}$	137	68.7	34	84.5	0	168	34.8	35	44.8	0	182	20.3	45	28.4	0
M_0	94	106.8	0	21.7	0	139	61.7	0	17.9	0	164	36.7	0	13.3	0
M_b	284*	415.9*	87	3270.3*	0	218*	130.7*	93	942.1*	0	197	18.4	94	86.8	0
M_{c_1}	114	87.4	3	50.2	0	150	50.5	1	28.7	0	170	30.7	2	18.9	0
$M_{c_1 b}$	284*	415.9*	87	3270.3*	0	218*	130.7*	93	942.1*	0	197	18.4	94	86.8	0
M_{c_2}	130	73.6	31	85.2	0	158	43.9	8	36.5	0	174	27.2	8	22.2	0
$M_{c_2 b}$	284*	415.9*	87	3270.3*	0	218*	130.7*	93	942.1*	0	197	18.4	94	86.8	0
M_t	93	107.2	0	21.3	0	139	61.9	0	17.7	0	164	36.8	0	13.2	0

TABLE 7. *Simulation study with 100 simulated datasets for each simulation setting (Trial 7-12) where true generating model is $M_{z_{g_n}}$: empirical average ($\tilde{N}$) of the point estimate $\hat{N}$, root mean square error (rmse), confidence intervals coverage (CI %), average length of the confidence intervals (l_{CI}) and percentage of times each competing model has achieved best AIC (%aic). The $*$ sign denotes the presence of likelihood failure $\hat{N} = \infty$ (Alunni Fegatelli and Tardella, 2013). We are reporting a finite rmse computed after removing those failure cases. Nominal level of the confidence interval* $1 - \alpha = 0.95$.

$[0, 1]$. We have provided a natural interpretation of such a covariate z as a meaningful proxy for a *memory effect* and formal correspondence with the Markovian dependence. We have also discussed some other alternative quantifications. The basic idea of the new model framework can be easily implemented within the setup of a logistic model where each capture occurrence x_{ij} is considered as a binary outcome with $r(z_{ij})$ as the basic linear predictor of the log-odds of the corresponding probability. The function r could be either a linear or non linear function of z_{ij}. In this case, when the non linear function is a step function it turns out to partition conditional probability parameters into equivalence classes possibly recovering known standard behavioural or temporal models such as M_b or M_{c_k} and M_t and discovering new meaningful ones such as $M_{z.cut(k)}$.

Indeed the use of this general framework allowed us to revisit some well known datasets and discover new parsimonious behavioural patterns that better fit the the observed data. The discernibility of new non-enduring patterns with respect to already available enduring or ephemeral behavioral effects has been verified with a simulation study where the AIC criterion is able to recover the new pattern in most simulated datasets. Point and interval estimates yield convincing results in terms of small RMSE and adequate coverage.

Unconditional likelihood inference is easily implemented recycling consolidated standard GLM routines. An integrated suite of R (R Core Team, 2013) functions have been developed and are available as an R package upon request.

We hint also at a possible extension outside the closed capture-recapture context of the quantization idea. The same idea can be applied more generally to model memory effects in studies with longitudinal binary outcomes where binary events such as successful surgery experiences or correctly performed tasks are observed. Also it is possible to generalize this strategy to categorical-ordinal data using an appropriate scaling.

There are certainly other issues which should be addressed for a more thorough understanding of real data such as allowing for heterogeneous capture probabilities and including the possible presence of individual covariates. While the former aspect can be easily accommodated and implemented as already argued within the standard GLM framework through the addition of a longitudinal individual random effect the latter is more difficult to be embedded in the proposed inferential setting which uses the unconditional likelihood. In this case individual covariates would not be available for unobserved units. Indeed possible alternative ways out are the use of conditional likelihood or implementing our models using data augmentation within a Bayesian framework following the approach in Royle (2009). We actually plan to develop this in a future work. Actually some previous work on alternative inferential approaches for standard behavioural models Alunni Fegatelli and Tardella (2013) suggests that the Bayesian approach could be more promising. Here we have focussed more specifically on understanding the role, meaning and possible alternative uses of the new memory-effect covariates and their connections with already available models.

References

J. M. Alho. Logistic regression in capture-recapture models. *Biometrics*, 46:623–635, 1990.

D. Alunni Fegatelli and L. Tardella. Improved inference on capture recapture models with behavioural effects. *Statistical Methods & Applications*, 22(1):45–66, 2013.

S. C. Amstrup, T. L. McDonald, and B. F. Manly, editors. *Handbook of Capture-Recapture Analysis*. Princeton University Press, 2005.

F. Bartolucci and F. Pennoni. A Class of Latent Markov Models for Capture-Recapture Data Allowing for Time, Heterogeneity, and Behavior Effects. *Biometrics*, 63(2):568–578, 2007.

D. Böhning. Editorial - recent developments in capture-recapture methods and their applications. *Biometrical Journal*, 50(6):954–956, 2008.

D. Borchers, S. Buckland, and W. Zucchini. *Estimating Animal Abundance: Closed Populations*. Statistics for Biology and Health. Springer, 2002.

A. Chao, W. Chu, and C.-H. Hsu. Capture-recapture when time and behavioral response affect capture probabilities. *Biometrics*, 56(2):427–433, 2000.

A. Farcomeni and D. Scacciatelli. Heterogeneity and behavioral response in continuous time capture-recapture, with application to street cannabis use in italy. *to appear on the Annals of Applied Statistics*, 2014.

A. Farcomeni. Recapture models under equality constraints for the conditional capture probabilities. *Biometrika*, 2011.

S. K. Ghosh and J. L. Norris. Bayesian capture-recapture analysis and model selection allowing for heterogeneity and behavioral effects. *Journal of Agricultural, Biological, and Environmental Statistics*, 10(1):35–49, 2005.

R. M. Huggins. On the statistical analysis of capture experiments. *Biometrika*, 76:133–140, 1989.

W.-H. Hwang and R. Huggins. A semiparametric model for a functional behavioural response to capture in capture-recapture experiments. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Statistics*, 53(4):403–421, 2011.

W.-H. Hwang, A. Chao, and P. S. F. Yip. Continuous-time capture-recapture models with time variation and behavioural response. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Statistics*, 44(1):41–54, 2002.

S.-M. Lee and C. W. S. Chen. Bayesian inference of population size for behavioral response models. *Statistica Sinica*, 8:1233–1248, 1998.

S.-M. Lee, W.-H. Hwang, and L.-H. Huang. Bayes estimation of population size from capture-recapture models with time variation and behavior response. *Statistica Sinica*, 13(2):477–494, 2003.

B. Morgan and R. McCrea. *Analysis of Capture-Recapture Data*. Chapman & Hall/Crc Interdisciplinary Statistics. Taylor & Francis, 2013.

R Core Team. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2013.

F. Ramsey and P. Severns. Persistence models for mark-recapture. *Environmental and Ecological Statistics*, 17:97–109, 2010.

J. Royle, R. Chandler, R. Sollmann, and B. Gardner. *Spatial Capture-Recapture*. Elsevier Science, 2013.

J. A. Royle. Analysis of capture-recapture models with individual covariates using data augmentation. *Biometrics*, 65(1):267–274, 2009.

C. Schwarz and G. Seber. Estimating animal abundance: review iii. *Statistical Science*, 14:427–456, 1999.

G. A. F. Seber. *Estimation of Animal Abundance (Second Edition)*. Charles Griffin, 1987.

T. C. Wanger, I. Motzke, S. C. Furrer, B. W. Brook, and B. Gruber. How to monitor elusive lizards: comparison of capture-recapture methods on giant day geckos (gekkonidae, phelsuma madagascariensis grandis) in the masoala rainforest exhibit, zurich zoo. *Ecological Research*, 24:345–353, 2009.

G. C. White, D. R. Anderson, K. P. Burnham, and D. L. Otis. *Capture-recapture and Removal Methods for Sampling Closed Populations*. Los Alamos National Laboratory, 1982.

H.-C. Yang and A. Chao. Modeling animals' behavioral response by Markov chain models for capture-recapture experiments. *Biometrics*, 61(4):1010–1017, 2005.

P. S. F. Yip, L. Xi, A. Chao, and W.-H. Hwang. Estimating the population size with a behavioral response in capture-recapture experiment. *Environmental and Ecological Statistics*, 7(4):405–414, 2000.

Supplementary Web Materials for "Flexible behavioral capture-recapture modelling"

S1. Further examples of meaningful models based on partitions

We have seen how some classical models (M_b, M_{c_1} and M_{c_2}) correspond to specific ways of partitioning the set of all partial capture histories $H = \cup_{b=1}^{B} H_b$ and setting equal all the conditional probabilities with conditioning partial capture history $\mathbf{x}$ belonging to the same partition set H_b as follows

$$p_{l_{\mathbf{x}}+1}(\mathbf{x}) = p_{H_b} \qquad \forall \quad \mathbf{x} \in H_b$$

Now we provide other instances of partitions which can be associated to different classical and new models accounting for longitudinal behavioral and temporal patterns.

We will show four partitions corresponding to the so-called *time-effect* model M_t, the mixed *ephemeral-enduring* effect model $M_{c_1 b}$ introduced in Yang and Chao (2005), the behavioural *vanishing-effect* model M_{L_2} proposed in Farcomeni (2011) and, as a new proposal, an alternative behavioural model denoted with M_{count} where the capture probabilities vary according to the *absolute* number of previous captures occurred. To simplify notation and understanding let us consider a discrete capture-recapture experiment with $t = 5$ capture occasions. We start with the classical *time-effect* model M_t which corresponds to the following partition in $t = 5$ subsets

$$\mathcal{H}_5(M_t) \; : \begin{cases} H_1 = \{()\} \\ H_2 = \{(0),(1)\} \\ H_3 = \{(0,0),(1,0),(0,1),(1,1)\} \\ H_4 = \{(0,0,0),(1,0,0),(0,1,0),(1,1,0),(0,0,1),(1,0,1),(0,1,1),(1,1,1)\} \\ H_5 = \{(0,0,0,0),(1,0,0,0),(0,1,0,0),(1,1,0,0),(0,0,1,0),(1,0,1,0), \\ \qquad (0,1,1,0),(1,1,1,0),(0,0,0,1),(1,0,0,1),(0,1,0,1), \\ \qquad (1,1,0,1),(0,0,1,1),(1,0,1,1),(0,1,1,1),(1,1,1,1)\} \end{cases}$$

The set H is partitioned according just to the length of partial capture histories which identifies each capture occasion without considering the pattern of the occurrences. In fact with this partition we are modelling a temporal pattern rather than a behavioural effect.

The mixed *ephemeral-enduring* effect model $M_{c_1 b}$ introduced in Yang and Chao (2005) can be regarded as a model where conditional probabilities are grouped according to conditioning partial capture histories belonging to subsets of the following partition:

$$\mathcal{H}_3(M_{c_1 b}) : \begin{cases} H_1 = \{(),(0),(0,0),(0,0,0),(0,0,0,0) \\ H_2 = \{(1,0),(1,0,0),(0,1,0),(1,1,0), \\ \qquad (1,0,0,0),(0,1,0,0),(1,1,0,0),(0,0,1,0),(1,0,1,0),(0,1,1,0),(1,1,1,0)\} \\ H_3 = \{(1),(0,1),(1,1),(0,0,1),(1,0,1),(0,1,1),(1,1,1),(0,0,0,1), \\ \qquad (1,0,0,1),(0,1,0,1),(1,1,0,1),(0,0,1,1),(1,0,1,1),(0,1,1,1),(1,1,1,1)\} \end{cases}$$

As in model M_{c_1} we partition the set H according to the occurrence (0 or 1) in the last position. However, differently from the standard first order Markovian model, in correspondence of the same conditioning event $x_{l_{\mathbf{x}}} = 0$, one distinguishes those histories $\mathbf{x}$ where a previous capture has occurred at least once (H_2) from those where no previous capture has occurred (H_1).

As defined in Farcomeni (2011) "model M_{L_2} corresponds to a vanishing behavioural effect if the animal is not captured in most recent occasion, or captured only once in the last three

occasions". It corresponds to the bipartition

$$\mathcal{H}_2(M_{L_2}) \ : \begin{cases} H_1 = \{(), (0), (1,0), (0,0,0)(1,0,0), (0,1,0), (1,1,0), (0,0,1), \\ \qquad (0,0,0,0)(0,1,0,0), (0,0,1,0), (0,1,1,0), (0,0,0,1), \\ \qquad (1,0,0,0)(1,1,0,0), (1,0,1,0), (1,1,1,0), (1,0,0,1)\} \\ H_2 = \{(1), (0,1), (1,1), (1,0,1), (0,1,1), (1,1,1), (0,1,0,1), \\ \qquad (0,0,1,1), (0,1,1,1), (1,1,0,1), (1,0,1,1), (1,1,1,1)\} \end{cases}$$

Indeed, it can be regarded also as a specific constrained Markovian model of order 3.

Another model which can be of some interest is expressed in terms of the following partition

$$\mathcal{H}_5(M_{count}) \ : \begin{cases} H_1 = \{(), (0), (0,0), (0,0,0), (0,0,0,0)\} \\ H_2 = \{(1)(1,0), (0,1), (1,0,0), (0,1,0), (0,0,1), \\ \qquad (1,0,0,0), (0,1,0,0), (0,0,1,0), \}, (0,0,0,1) \\ H_3 = \{(1,1), (1,1,0), (1,0,1), (0,1,1), (1,1,0,0), \\ \qquad (1,0,1,0), (0,1,1,0), (1,0,0,1), (0,1,0,1), , (0,0,1,1)\} \\ H_4 = \{(1,1,1), (1,1,1,0), (1,1,0,1), (1,0,1,1), (0,1,1,1)\} \\ H_5 = \{(1,1,1,1)\} \end{cases}$$

In each subset of the partition $\mathcal{H}_5(M_{count})$ the partial capture histories have the same number of captures (the same number of 1's). Notice also that the partition $\mathcal{H}_5(M_{count})$ shares the same subset H_1 of $\mathcal{H}_3(M_{c_1b})$ and $\mathcal{H}_2(M_b)$. In view of the likelihood factorization already argued in Alunni Fegatelli and Tardella (2013) we have

$$L(N, \mathbf{p}_{\mathcal{H}_B}) \propto \left[\binom{N}{M} p_{H_1}^{n_{(H_1 1)}} (1-p_{H_1})^{n_{(H_1 0)}+t(N-M)}\right] \prod_{b=2}^{B} p_{H_b}^{n_{(H_b 1)}} (1-p_{H_b})^{n_{(H_b 0)}}$$

where, for each $b = 1, 2, ..., B$, $n_{(H_b 0)}$ is the number of times that all the observed units which experience partial capture history $\mathbf{x}$ belonging to H_b are not captured at time $l_{\mathbf{x}} + 1$; similarly $n_{(H_b 1)}$ is the number of times that the observed units which experience partial capture history $\mathbf{x}$ belonging to H_b are captured at time $l_{\mathbf{x}} + 1$. Formally $\forall\, b = 1, \ldots, B$

$$n_{(H_b 0)} = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in H_b} I\left[(x_{i1}, \ldots, x_{il_{\mathbf{x}}}) = \mathbf{x}\,,\ x_{il_{\mathbf{x}}+1} = 0\right]$$
$$n_{(H_b 1)} = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in H_b} I\left[(x_{i1}, \ldots, x_{il_{\mathbf{x}}}) = \mathbf{x}\,,\ x_{il_{\mathbf{x}}+1} = 1\right]$$

This implies that all models sharing the same counts $n_{(H_1 0)}$ and $n_{(H_1 1)}$ (and this is always true when they share the same H_1) have the same profile likelihood for N and yield the same point and interval estimates for N. Hence this is true for models M_{count}, $M_{c_1 b}$ and M_b.

S2. Proof of the relationship of the numerical quantification $g(\mathbf{x})$ with Markovian models of arbitrary order k

In order to prove the relationship between the proposed numerical quantification $z = g(\mathbf{x})$ and the generic k-th order Markovian structure expressed through the conditional probabilities $p_{l_{\mathbf{x}}+1}(\mathbf{x})$ we will show a correspondence beween the range of $z = g(\mathbf{x})$ and the range $\mathcal{X}^k$ of the last k digits of $\mathbf{x}$ such that

$$z = g(\mathbf{x}) \in I_r \Longleftrightarrow \sum_{p=1}^{k} x_{l_{\mathbf{x}}-k+p}\, 2^{p-1} = r - 1$$

where $I_1 = [0, 1/2^k]$ and $I_r = \left(\frac{r-1}{2^k}, \frac{r}{2^k}\right]$ for any $r = 2, ..., 2^k$. In fact, this means that the subset I_r which $g(\mathbf{x})$ turns out to belong to depends only on the last k digits of $\mathbf{x}$. Hence if $s(z)$ is a

step function defined as follows

$$s(z) = logit(p_{H_r}) \qquad \forall z \in I_r$$

for any $r = 1, ..., 2^k$, the conditional probability corresponding to our logistic framework based on z

$$Pr\left(X_{il_{\mathbf{x}}+1} = 1 \,|X_{i1} = x_1, ..., X_{il_{\mathbf{x}}-k+1} = x_{l_{\mathbf{x}}-k+1}, ..., X_{il_{\mathbf{x}}} = x_{l_{\mathbf{x}}}\right) = s(g(\mathbf{x})) = s(z)$$

depends on the binary configuration of the last k binary digits (occurrences) as prescribed in any k-th order Markovian model

$$\begin{aligned} Pr\left(X_{il_{\mathbf{x}}+1} = 1 \,|X_{i1} = x_1, ..., X_{il_{\mathbf{x}}-k+1} = x_{l_{\mathbf{x}}-k+1}, ..., X_{il_{\mathbf{x}}} = x_{l_{\mathbf{x}}}\right) = \\ = Pr\left(X_{il_{\mathbf{x}}+1} = 1 \,|X_{il_{\mathbf{x}}-k+1} = x_{l_{\mathbf{x}}-k+1}, ..., X_{il_{\mathbf{x}}} = x_{l_{\mathbf{x}}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Indeed for any $r \in \{1, ..., 2^k\}$ there is only one configuration $(x_{l_{\mathbf{x}}-k+1}, ..., x_{l_{\mathbf{x}}}) \in \mathcal{X}^k$ such that

$$\sum_{p=1}^{k} x_{l_{\mathbf{x}}-k+p}\, 2^{p-1} = r - 1.$$

In order to fully understand the ensuing behavioural model based on the partition induced by the partitioning of the covariate range $[0, 1] = \cup_{r=1}^{2^k} I_r$, we need to distinguish two cases:

- the case where the conditioning partial capture history $\mathbf{x}$ is a binary sequence with length greater than or equal to k ($l_{\mathbf{x}} \geq k$)
- the case where the conditioning binary sequence $\mathbf{x}$ has length less than k ($l_{\mathbf{x}} < k$).

The latter case does not involve the k-th order Markov property but it affects the parameterization related to the initial conditional probabilities which can be defined in a somewhat arbitrary fashion. We will look at each case separately in the following two subsections.

S2.1. **Mapping $z = g(\mathbf{x})$ with partial histories with length greater than or equal to k.** Recall that for any fixed positive integer k there is a one-to-one mapping between the possible configurations of k digits $\mathcal{X}^k$ and the first 2^k non negative integers $\{0, 1, ..., 2^k - 1\}$. Let us consider a generic partial capture history $\mathbf{x}$ of length $l_{\mathbf{x}} \geq k$.

In the definition of the basic mapping

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = f(x_1, \ldots, x_{l_{\mathbf{x}}}) = \sum_{j=1}^{l_{\mathbf{x}}} x_j 2^{j-1} \in \{0, 1, 2, ..., 2^{l_{\mathbf{x}}} - 1\}$$

used to build up our $z = g(\mathbf{x})$ the sum involving the last k digits can take 2^k different values. Formally it can be written as

$$\sum_{j=l_{\mathbf{x}}-k+1}^{l_{\mathbf{x}}} x_j\, 2^{j-1} \;=\; 2^{l_{\mathbf{x}}-k} \sum_{p=1}^{k} x_{l_{\mathbf{x}}-k+p}\, 2^{p-1}$$

which for $(x_{l_{\mathbf{x}}-k+1}, \ldots x_{l_{\mathbf{x}}}) \in \mathcal{X}^k$ takes value in $\{c \cdot 0, c \cdot 1, \ldots, c \cdot y\}$ where $c = 2^{l_{\mathbf{x}}-k}$. Hence the ratio which defines the function g can be rewritten as follows

$$\frac{\sum_{j=l_{\mathbf{x}}-k+1}^{l_{\mathbf{x}}} x_j\, 2^{j-1}}{2^{l_{\mathbf{x}}} - 1} \;=\; \frac{\sum_{p=1}^{k} x_{l_{\mathbf{x}}-k+p}\, 2^{p-1}}{2^k - \frac{1}{2^{l_{\mathbf{x}}-k}}} \;\in\; \left\{0, \frac{1}{2^k - \frac{1}{2^{l_{\mathbf{x}}-k}}}, \ldots, \frac{2^k - 1}{2^k - \frac{1}{2^{l_{\mathbf{x}}-k}}}\right\} \tag{12}$$

On the other hand, considering the sum involving the first $(l_{\mathbf{x}} - k)$ digits of the binary sequence we can get the following bounds

$$0 \;\leq\; \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{l_{\mathbf{x}}-k} x_j\, 2^{j-1}}{2^{l_{\mathbf{x}}} - 1} \;\leq\; \frac{2^{l_{\mathbf{x}}-k} - 1}{2^{l_{\mathbf{x}}} - 1} \;=\; \frac{1 - \frac{1}{2^{l_{\mathbf{x}}-k}}}{2^k - \frac{1}{2^{l_{\mathbf{x}}-k}}} \tag{13}$$

For any $(x_{l_{\mathbf{x}}-k+1},\dots,x_{l_{\mathbf{x}}}) \in \mathcal{X}^k$ from (12) we can represent

$$\frac{\sum_{j=l_{\mathbf{x}}-k+1}^{l_{\mathbf{x}}} x_j\, 2^{j-1}}{2^{l_{\mathbf{x}}}-1} = \frac{r-1}{2^k - \frac{1}{2^{l_{\mathbf{x}}-k}}} \tag{14}$$

for some $r \in \{1,\dots,2^k\}$ so that the following inequalities hold

$$\frac{r-1}{2^k} \;<\; \frac{r-1}{2^k - \frac{1}{2^{l_{\mathbf{x}}-k}}} \;\leq\; \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{l_{\mathbf{x}}} x_j\, 2^{j-1}}{2^{l_{\mathbf{x}}}-1} = g(\mathbf{x}) \;\leq\; \frac{1-\frac{1}{2^{l_{\mathbf{x}}-k}}}{2^k - \frac{1}{2^{l_{\mathbf{x}}-k}}} + \frac{r-1}{2^k - \frac{1}{2^{l_{\mathbf{x}}-k}}} \;\leq\; \frac{r}{2^k} \tag{15}$$

Indeed the second inequality follows from the fact that the *rhs* has the sum running over all the elements of the binary sequence while the *lhs* corresponds to (14) where the sum runs over the last k elements only. The third inequality follows combining (13) and (14). Finally, the last inequality follows from the fact that $\forall\, r \in \{1,\dots,2^k\}$ we have

$$\frac{r-\frac{1}{2^{l_{\mathbf{x}}-k}}}{2^k - \frac{1}{2^{l_{\mathbf{x}}-k}}} - \frac{r}{2^k} = \frac{2^{l_{\mathbf{x}}-k}\left[r-\frac{1}{2^{l_{\mathbf{x}}-k}}\right]}{2^{l_{\mathbf{x}}}-1} - \frac{r}{2^k} = \frac{r-2^k}{(2^{l_{\mathbf{x}}}-1)2^k} \leq 0$$

In this way we have formally proved that for any partial capture history $\mathbf{x}^{'}$ and $\mathbf{x}^{''}$ sharing the same last k digits we have that $g(\mathbf{x}^{'}) \in I_r$ and $g(\mathbf{x}^{''}) \in I_r$ for a suitable integer

$$r-1 = \sum_{p=1}^{k} x_{l_{\mathbf{x}}-k+p}\, 2^{p-1}.$$

This implies that $z = g(\mathbf{x}) \in I_r$ if and only if the binary configurations of last k digits of $\mathbf{x}$ correspond to the integer $r-1$. These k digits in fact correspond to the last k occurrences of each partial capture history in H_r provided there are at least as much. This essentially leads us to a Markovian model of order k.

S2.2. **Mapping $z = g(\mathbf{x})$ with partial histories with length less than k.** We begin with a simple example of Markov model of order $k = 2$ in a capture-recapture experiment with $t = 5$ occasions. It points out some critical aspects in recovering the desired Markovian model when using the covariate $z = g(\mathbf{x})$ also for partial capture histories $\mathbf{x}$ with length $l_{\mathbf{x}} < k$. In fact, if we look at the numerical values of $z = g(\mathbf{x})$ displayed in Table 2 of our main paper and we keep on partitioning the set H according to the value of $g(\mathbf{x})$ into the subintervals $I_1 = \left[0, \frac{1}{4}\right]$, $I_2 = \left[\frac{1}{4}, \frac{2}{4}\right]$, $I_3 = \left[\frac{2}{4}, \frac{3}{4}\right]$, $I_4 = \left[\frac{3}{4}, 1\right]$ we obtain the following partition of the set H

$$\mathcal{H}_4(M_*) = \begin{cases} H_1 = \{(), (0), (00), (000), (100), (0000), (0100), (1000), (1100)\} \\ H_2 = \{(10), (010), (110), (0010), (0110), (1010), (1110)\} \\ H_3 = \{(01), (001), (101), (0001), (0101), (1001), (1101)\} \\ H_4 = \{(1), (11), (011), (111), (0011), (0111), (1011), (1111)\} \end{cases} \tag{16}$$

Differently from the partition corresponding to model M_{c_2} considered in Farcomeni (2011) and denoted as $\mathcal{H}_4(M_{c_2})$ in formula (4) of our main article the partial capture history (1), corresponding to one capture in the first occasion, belongs to the subset H_4 instead of H_3. In fact, looking at the partial histories with $l_{\mathbf{x}} \leq 1$ we have that $\mathbf{x}' = ()$ and $\mathbf{x}'' = (0)$ are mapped in $z' = g(\mathbf{x}') = 0$ and $z'' = g(\mathbf{x}'') = 0$ and they both fall in the same interval I_1 where also $(0, 0)$ is mapped. On the other hand the partial capture history $\mathbf{x} = (1)$ is mapped in $z = g(\mathbf{x}) = 1$ which falls in the interval I_4 where also $(1, 1)$ is mapped. This last mapping somehow breaks the correspondence with $\mathcal{H}_4(M_{c_2})$ as in in formula (4) of our main article although the model associated to $\mathcal{H}_4(M_*)$ is still Markovian of order 2 since the initial conditional probabilities are irrelevant for the Markov property. The difference between the two partitions depends on the arbitrary ways in which one can define the initial conditional probabilities namely those

whose conditioning events correspond to partial capture histories whose length is less than k. If one likes to recover exactly the partition $\mathcal{H}_4(M_{c_2})$ by means of partitioning the covariate range there is a simple modification to fix that. For a generic partial capture history $\mathbf{x}$ with length $l_{\mathbf{x}} < k$ obviously one cannot get the usual dependence on the last k digits since the length of $\mathbf{x}$ is smaller. In this case one may artificially complete the partial capture history augmenting it in a conventional way with $k - l_{\mathbf{x}}$ fictitious digits ahead. In this way, we are back to dealing with a partial capture history with at least k digits as in the previous subsection. Indeed in the Markovian models M_{c_k} proposed in Yang and Chao (2005) and Farcomeni (2011) it is assumed that the $k - l_{\mathbf{x}}$ unobserved/missing/imaginary previous digits are all set equal to 0.

In our previous example if we insert $k = 2$ zeroes ahead of each actually observed partial capture history $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_{l_{\mathbf{x}}})$ and denote the augmented sequence with $\mathbf{x}_{aug}$ we can then basically recover the partition $\mathcal{H}_4(M_{c_2})$ as follows

$$\begin{cases} H_1 = \{(\underline{0,0}), (\underline{0,0},0), (\underline{0,0},0,0), (\underline{0,0},0,0,0), (\underline{0,0},1,0,0), (\underline{0,0},0,0,0,0), \\ \qquad (\underline{0,0},0,1,0,0), (\underline{0,0},1,0,0,0), (\underline{0,0},1,1,0,0)\} \\ H_2 = \{(\underline{0,0},1,0), (\underline{0,0},0,1,0), (\underline{0,0},1,1,0), (\underline{0,0},0,0,1,0), \\ \qquad (\underline{0,0},0,1,1,0), (\underline{0,0},1,0,1,0), (\underline{0,0},1,1,1,0)\}, \\ H_3 = \{(\underline{0,0},1), (\underline{0,0},0,1), (\underline{0,0},0,0,1), (\underline{0,0},1,0,1), \\ \qquad (\underline{0,0},0,0,0,1), (\underline{0,0},0,1,0,1), (\underline{0,0},1,0,0,1), (\underline{0,0},1,1,0,1)\} \\ H_4 = \{(\underline{0,0},1,1), (\underline{0,0},0,1,1), (\underline{0,0},1,1,1), \\ \qquad (\underline{0,0},0,0,1,1), (\underline{0,0},0,1,1,1), (\underline{0,0},1,0,1,1), (\underline{0,0},1,1,1,1)\} \end{cases}$$

which yields the correspondence $\mathbf{x}_{aug} \in H_r$ if and only if $g(\mathbf{x}_{aug}) \in I_r$. Notice that we have marked the imputed initial segment with an underlying sign. In this way the empty partial capture history () changes in $(\underline{0,0})$, (0) changes in $(\underline{0,0},0)$, (1) changes in $(\underline{0,0},1)$ and so on.

More generally and formally in order to use our approach of partitioning H through subintervals I_1,...,I_{2^k} of a suitable numerical covariate to get the correspondence with the k-th order Markovian models as in Yang and Chao (2005) and Farcomeni (2011) one can modify the definition of the original numeric summary $z = g(\mathbf{x})$ slightly changing its argument $\mathbf{x}$ into an augmented history $\mathbf{x}_{aug} = (0, .., 0, \mathbf{x})$ with $k - l_{\mathbf{x}}$ zeroes ahead as follows

$$g_{aug}(\mathbf{x}) = g(\mathbf{x}_{aug}).$$

This can be formalized in matrix notation considering the whole binary capture history matrix $\mathbf{X}$ and deriving an augmented matrix $\mathbf{X}_{aug} = [\underline{\mathbf{0}, ..., \mathbf{0}}, \mathbf{X}]$ obtained by adding k columns of zeros on the left side of the original matrix $\mathbf{X}$. One can compute in the usual way the corresponding covariate matrix $\mathbf{Z}_{aug}$ by applying the original function g to all partial capture histories in $\mathbf{X}_{aug}$. At this point, instead of the former matrix $\mathbf{Z}$ built directly from $\mathbf{X}$ one uses as covariate matrix only the last t columns of $\mathbf{Z}_{aug}$.

S3. Models driven by partitions of the range of meaningful behavioural covariates and the search of optimal partitions

Let us now show that model M_{L_2} proposed in Farcomeni (2011) can be recovered within our general logistic regression framework which relies on the meaningful numeric covariate z adopting as a regression function a step function with only two levels corresponding to the bipartition of the range of z into two contiguous intervals: $[0, 0.625]; (0.625, 1]$. In fact, for the initial partial capture histories (1), (01) and for all other $\mathbf{x}$ with $l_{\mathbf{x}} \geq 3$ such that $(x_1, \ldots, x_{l_{\mathbf{x}-3}}, 1, 0, 1)$, $(x_1, \ldots, x_{l_{\mathbf{x}-3}}, 0, 1, 1)$ and $(x_1, \ldots, x_{l_{\mathbf{x}-3}}, 1, 1, 1)$ we have that $z > 0.625$. This can be easily checked numerically for the first two histories $\mathbf{x}_1 = (1)$ and $\mathbf{x}_2 = (01)$ since $g(\mathbf{x}_1) = 1$ and $g(\mathbf{x}_2) = 2/3$. For all the other partial capture histories we can focus on the last three digits. We

have already argued that there are $8 = 2^3$ subintervals $I_1 = [0, 1/2^3]$ and $I_r = \left(\frac{r-1}{2^3}, \frac{r}{2^3}\right]$ for any $r = 1, ..., 2^3$ such that $z \in I_r$ if and only if $\sum_{p=1}^{3} x_{l_{\mathbf{x}}-3+p}\, 2^{p-1} = r-1$. Since $(0.625, 1] = I_6 \cup I_7 \cup I_8$ one can easily verify numerically that the only three last digits $(x_{l_{\mathbf{x}-2}}, x_{l_{\mathbf{x}-1}}, x_{l_{\mathbf{x}}})$ such that $\sum_{p=1}^{3} x_{l_{\mathbf{x}}-3+p}\, 2^{p-1} = r - 1 \geq 5$ are $(1, 0, 1)$, $(0, 1, 1)$ and $(1, 1, 1)$. Hence the intervals $[0, 0.625]$ and $(0.625, 1]$ lead to the same bipartition of the set H considered in model M_{L_2}. We also remark that in light of our argument there is an underlying correspondence between model M_{L_2} and Markovian models of order $k = 3$ related to partition intervals $I_r = \left(\frac{r-1}{2^3}, \frac{r}{2^3}\right]$ of the behavioural covariate $z = g(\mathbf{x})$. In fact we can regard model M_{L_2} as a simplified reduced Markovian model of order $k = 3$.

Indeed once acknowledged that model M_{L_2} corresponds to one of the possible bipartition of the range of z one can wonder whether there are other bipartitions which can fit the data better. This naturally leads us to look for an optimal bipartition of the range in terms of the AIC resulting from the corresponding model. We considered models associated to alternative intervals $[0, e_1] \cup (e_1, 1]$ and eventually determine the best cutpoint $e_1^* \in [0, 1]$ denoting the corresponding bipartition of partial capture histories with $\mathcal{H}_2(M_{z.cut(1)}) = \{H_1, H_2\}$ where H_1 and H_2 are such that

$$\mathbf{x} \in H_1 \iff g(\mathbf{x}) \in [0, e_1^*] \qquad ; \qquad \mathbf{x} \in H_2 \iff g(\mathbf{x}) \in (e_1^*, 1]$$

In fact, in our applications we found the optimal cutpoint through a simple finite grid search among all the values $e_1 = g(\mathbf{x})$ corresponding to an actually observed partial capture history $\mathbf{x}$. We remark that the optimal single cut found in the Great Copper example ends up being $e_1^* = 0.625$ which actually corresponds to model M_{L_2}.

Moreover, this idea can be extended to more than one cutpoint. In this case the computational burden for the finite grid search with cutpoints corresponding to actually observed partial capture histories becomes heavier. Despite that in all our real data applications and simulations we were able to easily implement the full search up to two cutpoints. For more than two cutpoints we considered two alternative strategies: performing a simplified search reducing the set of possible cuts to a subset of quantifications of actually observed partial capture histories or starting from previously determined optimal cuts and looking for a further cut which is located in between.